

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/771,334	02/05/2004	Roland Fulford	1912-0288P	2550
	7590 06/01/2007 ART KOLASCH & BIRCI	EXAMINER		
PO BOX 747		CAIN, EDWARD J		
FALLS CHUR	CH, VA 22040-0747		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1714	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/01/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

		A II A! : - N -	A see B = seed a \				
		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/771,334	FULFORD ET AL.				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
	·	Edward J. Cain	1714				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE in me may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. It is period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNIC B6(a). In no event, however, may a re will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT cause the application to become ABA	CATION. Lepty be timely filed THS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 Fe	ebruary 2007.					
2a)⊠	This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.						
3)	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositi	ion of Claims						
4)🖂	Claim(s) <u>1-71</u> is/are pending in the application.						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5)	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)🛛	6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-4,6,8,10-37 and 41-70</u> is/are rejected.						
7)🖂	Claim(s) <u>5,7,9,38-40 and 71</u> is/are objected to.						
8)□	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.					
Applicati	ion Papers						
9)[The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached	Office Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority (ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document: 2. Certified copies of the priority document: 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureausee the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Aprity documents have been u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Stage				
Attachmer		🗖					
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date				
3) 🛛 Infor	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date		nformal Patent Application				

Art Unit: 1714

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 11, 16-17, 53-55, 57-63 and 65-68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sverdrup.

Sverdrup discloses methods of reclaiming rubber. These methods include mixing scrap rubber with reclaiming oils with heat (400 F, example 1) followed by cooling. The mixing step is taught as generating the heat and is seen as involving shear forces Suitable rubber is taught as styrene butadiene (Buna-S) copolymer.

Claims 1-4, 6, 8, 10, 11, 14-17 and 53-68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Fisher et al.

Fisher et al discloses methods for reclaiming scrap rubber including EPDM.

These methods include the addition of oil in amounts of up to 5% and the use of blenders which are seen as imparting shear forces and generating heat. The blender is taught as suitably operated at 3000 RPM and generating temperatures of 190 – 320 C. Particle sizes such as claimed instantly are also taught.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

⁽a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Application/Control Number: 10/771,334

Art Unit: 1714

Claims 12, 13, 18-37 and 41-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fisher et al.

Fisher et al is discussed above. This reference fails to explicitly recite a separate oil addition step, process times, rotation rates and specific oils as recited in the claims rejected under this paragraph.

Regarding oil addition, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add oil at any convenient point in the process depending upon the specific apparatus used.

Regarding the process times, times such as claimed would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art being dictated by the particular mixing apparatus used.

Regarding the rotation rates, rates such as claimed would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art being dictated by the mixing apparatus and the nature of the rubber used.

Regarding the process oils, oils such as claimed are notoriously well known in the rubber processing art and would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Claims 69 and 70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fisher et al in view of Mukai et al.

Fisher et al is discussed above. This reference fails to explicitly recite end uses for the regenerated rubber. Mukai et al discloses the use of regenerated rubber for automotive applications such as hoses.

Application/Control Number: 10/771,334

Art Unit: 1714

Claims 5, 7, 9 and 38-40 and 71 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Each of these rejections is maintained for reasons of record with the following additional comments. Applicants' have argued for patentability based on numerical temperature ranges. These ranges do not appear in the claims. Applicants have argued that the prior art methods result in undesirable degradation. Applicants need submit factual data in affidavit form.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Edward J. Cain whose telephone number is (571) 272-1118. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 10:00 to 6:00.

Application/Control Number: 10/771,334

Art Unit: 1714

Page 5

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vasu Jagannathan, can be reached on 571 272-1110. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Edward J. Cain Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1714